



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/784,596

02/23/2004

Michael D. Kotzin

CS24446RA

8311

20280 7590 11/18/2008
MOTOROLA INC
600 NORTH US HIGHWAY 45
W4 - 39Q
LIBERTYVILLE, IL 60048-5343

EXAMINER

WON, MICHAEL YOUNG

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2455

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

11/18/2008

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

DOCKETING.LIBERTYVILLE@MOTOROLA.COM
ADB035@Motorola.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/784,596	Applicant(s) KOTZIN ET AL.	
	Examiner MICHAEL Y. WON	Art Unit 2455	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 September 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed September 30, 2008.
2. Claims 1, 6, 10, 15, 19, and 20 have been amended.
3. Claims 1-20 have been examined and are pending with this action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the device" in the second element of the claim.

There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Domnitz (US 6,912,398).

INDEPENDENT:

As per **claim 1**, Domnitz teaches a method of a wireless communication device for managing dynamic containers comprising:

detecting a current time of the device (see col.4, lines 47-54: “determines the presence of an individual thorough the use of an identification device..., and based on individual’s identity and location and/or time”);

selecting, a particular channel among a plurality of channels associated with a dynamic container of the device based on the current time of the device, wherein the particular channel is selected by the device based on availability of the content of the particular channel at the current time (see col.4, lines 47-54: “and pushes the information down through the available information channels” and col.7, lines 1-3); and

displaying a unit of content of the particular channel via the dynamic container if an update time of the particular channel corresponds to the current time of the device (see col.8, lines 25-29 & 34-37; and col.10, lines 41-49: “channel being watched is being watched when an advertisement is due to run”).

Domnitz does not explicitly teach that the selecting occurs at the device associated with a user.

Domnitz does however teach that the selection of the information channel is predetermined (see col.7, lines 1-3: “selects appropriate information and transmits that information to the individual 1 via predetermined information channels”).

Art Unit: 2455

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Domnitz so that the predetermined selection occurs at the device associated with a user. One would be motivated to do so because the channel selection is based on the type and application of device associated with the user such as PDA, desktop computer, portable personal computer, wireless telephones, and so on (see col.7, lines 8-31). Therefore, since Domnitz teaches RFID is used to determine the identity of the client device (see col.4, lines 47-54), it is clearly suggested that the predetermined selection occurs at the device associated with the user (see col.7, lines 48-56).

As per **claim 6**, Domnitz teaches a method of a wireless communication device for managing dynamic containers comprising:

detecting a current location of the device (see col.4, lines 47-54: “determines the presence of an individual thorough the use of an identification device..., and based on individual’s identity and location and/or time”);

selecting a particular channel among a plurality of channels associated with a dynamic container of the device, wherein the particular channel is selected by the device based on the current location of the device (see col.4, lines 47-54: “and pushes the information down through the available information channels” and col.7, lines 1-3); and

displaying a unit of content of the particular channel via the dynamic container if an associated location of the particular channel corresponds to the current location of

Art Unit: 2455

the device (see col.10, lines 15-20: “dynamically updates the area to which information applies”).

Domnitz does not explicitly teach that the selecting occurs at the device associated with a user.

Domnitz does however teach that the selection of the information channel is predetermined (see col.7, lines 1-3: “selects appropriate information and transmits that information to the individual 1 via predetermined information channels”).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Domnitz so that the predetermined selection occurs at the device associated with a user. One would be motivated to do so because the channel selection is based on the type and application of device associated with the user such as PDA, desktop computer, portable personal computer, wireless telephones, and so on (see col.7, lines 8-31). Therefore, since Domnitz teaches RFID is used to determine the identity of the client device (see col.4, lines 47-54), it is clearly suggested that the predetermined selection occurs at the device associated with the user (see col.7, lines 48-56).

As per **claim 10**, Domnitz teaches a wireless communication device for managing dynamic containers comprising:

a timing circuit configured to detect a current time of the device (see col.4, lines 47-54: “determines the presence of an individual thorough the use of an identification device..., and based on individual’s identity and location and/or time”);

Art Unit: 2455

a processor coupled to the timing circuit, configured to select a particular channel, among a plurality of channels, associated with a dynamic container of the device based on the current time of the device (see col.4, lines 47-54: “and pushes the information down through the available information channels” and col.7, lines 1-3); and

a display, coupled to the processor, configured to provide a unit of content of the particular channel via the dynamic container if an update time of the particular channel corresponds to the current time of the device (see col.8, lines 25-29 & 34-37; and col.10, lines 41-49: “channel being watched is being watched when an advertisement is due to run”).

Domnitz does not explicitly teach that the selecting occurs at the processor associated with a user.

Domnitz does however teach that the selection of the information channel is predetermined (see col.7, lines 1-3: “selects appropriate information and transmits that information to the individual 1 via predetermined information channels”).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Domnitz so that the predetermined selection occurs at the processor associated with a user. One would be motivated to do so because the channel selection is based on the type and application of device associated with the user such as PDA, desktop computer, portable personal computer, wireless telephones, and so on (see col.7, lines 8-31). Therefore, since Domnitz teaches RFID is used to determine the identity of the client device (see col.4, lines 47-

Art Unit: 2455

54), it is clearly suggested that the predetermined selection occurs at the processor associated with the user (see col.7, lines 48-56).

As per **claim 15**, Domnitz teaches a wireless communication device for managing dynamic containers comprising:

a location circuit configured to detect a current location of the device (see col.4, lines 47-54: “determines the presence of an individual thorough the use of an identification device..., and based on individual’s identity and location and/or time”);

a processor coupled to the location circuit, configured to select a particular channel, among a plurality of channels, associated with a dynamic container of the device based on the current location of the device (see col.4, lines 47-54: “and pushes the information down through the available information channels” and col.7, lines 1-3); and

a display, coupled to the processor, configured to provide a unit of content of the particular channel via the dynamic container if an associated location of the particular channel corresponds to the current location of the device (see col.10, lines 15-20: “dynamically updates the area to which information applies”).

Domnitz does not explicitly teach that the selecting occurs at the device associated with a user.

Domnitz does however teach that the selection of the information channel is predetermined (see col.7, lines 1-3: “selects appropriate information and transmits that information to the individual 1 via predetermined information channels”).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Domnitz so that the predetermined selection occurs at the device associated with a user. One would be motivated to do so because the channel selection is based on the type and application of device associated with the user such as PDA, desktop computer, portable personal computer, wireless telephones, and so on (see col.7, lines 8-31). Therefore, since Domnitz teaches RFID is used to determine the identity of the client device (see col.4, lines 47-54), it is clearly suggested that the predetermined selection occurs at the device associated with the user (see col.7, lines 48-56).

As per **claim 19**, Domnitz teaches a wireless communication system for managing dynamic containers of a remote device comprising:

a processor configured to determine an update time of a particular channel, among a plurality of channels, associated with a dynamic container of the remote device, wherein the update time corresponds to a time period when content of the particular channel is recurringly updated (see col.10, lines 41-49: “using this information, referencing a commercial programming schedule store... channel being watched is being watched when an advertisement is due to run”); and

a transceiver, coupled to the processor, configured to provide a unit of content of the particular channel to the remote device before the update time of the particular channel (see col.10, lines 51-55: “transmitted immediately”).

Domnitz does not explicitly teach selecting a particular channel by the remote device associated with a user.

Domnitz does however teach that the selection of the information channel is predetermined (see col.7, lines 1-3: “selects appropriate information and transmits that information to the individual 1 via predetermined information channels”).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Domnitz so that remote device associated with a user selects/predetermines the information channel. One would be motivated to do so because the channel selection is based on the type and application of device associated with the user such as PDA, desktop computer, portable personal computer, wireless telephones, and so on (see col.7, lines 8-31). Therefore, since Domnitz teaches RFID is used to determine the identity of the client device (see col.4, lines 47-54), it is clearly suggested that the predetermined selection occurs at the remote device associated with the user (see col.7, lines 48-56).

As per **claim 20**, Domnitz teaches a wireless communication system for managing dynamic containers of a remote device comprising:

a processor configured to determine an associated location of a particular channel, among a plurality of channels, associated with a dynamic container of the remote device, wherein the associated location corresponds to a location of a source associated with the particular channel (see col.4, lines 47-54: “the system selects information related to the location or time and pushes the information down through the available information channel”; col.10, lines 15-20: “dynamically updates the area to which information applies”); and

Art Unit: 2455

a transceiver, coupled to the processor, configured to provide a unit of content of the particular channel to the remote device after the particular channel is determined by the processor (see col.10, lines 51-55: “transmitted immediately”).

Domnitz does not explicitly teach selecting a particular channel by the remote device associated with a user.

Domnitz does however teach that the selection of the information channel is predetermined (see col.7, lines 1-3: “selects appropriate information and transmits that information to the individual 1 via predetermined information channels”).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Domnitz so that remote device associated with a user selects/predetermines the information channel. One would be motivated to do so because the channel selection is based on the type and application of device associated with the user such as PDA, desktop computer, portable personal computer, wireless telephones, and so on (see col.7, lines 8-31). Therefore, since Domnitz teaches RFID is used to determine the identity of the client device (see col.4, lines 47-54), it is clearly suggested that the predetermined selection occurs at the remote device associated with the user (see col.7, lines 48-56).

DEPENDENT:

As per **claims 2 and 11**, which respectively depend on claims 1 and 10, Domnitz further teaches wherein the update time corresponds to a time period when content of the particular channel is recurringly updated (see col.10, lines 3-6 & 46-49).

As per **claims 3 and 12**, which respectively depend on claims 1 and 10, Domnitz teaches further comprising determining the update time by monitoring user interaction with the at least one channel during a predetermined time period (see col.6, lines 63-67 and col.10, lines 46-49).

As per **claims 4 and 13**, which respectively depend on claims 1 and 10, Domnitz teaches further comprising determining the update time by receiving the update time from a user of the device via a user interface (see col.10, lines 3-6).

As per **claims 5 and 14**, which respectively depend on claims 1 and 10, Domnitz teaches wherein comprising obtaining the unit of content of the particular channel before the update time of the particular channel via a transceiver (see col.10, lines 51-55).

As per **claims 7 and 16**, which respectively depend on claims 6 and 15, Domnitz further teaches wherein the associated location corresponds to a location of a source associated with the particular channel (see col.10, lines 46-49).

As per **claims 8 and 17**, which respectively depend on claims 6 and 15, Domnitz teaches further comprising determining the associated location by receiving the associated location from a source associated with the particular location via a transceiver (see col.10, lines 3-6).

As per **claims 9 and 18**, which respectively depend on claims 6 and 15, Domnitz teaches further comprising obtaining the unit of content of the particular channel after the particular channel is selected via a transceiver (see col.10, lines 47-49).

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed September 30, 2008 have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Domnitz teaches that the information channel selection is predetermined (see col.7, lines 1-3). Clearly, one of ordinary skill in the art agrees that the predetermining is a result of the type of device either registered or used in the system, which inherently employ different types of channels to transfer information, since Domnitz clearly teaches multiple client devices applicable in the system (see col.3, lines 38-45 and col.7, lines 8-31). Domnitz further supports this by teaching of identification information sent to the server for accessing the individual's records (see col.3, lines 30-33). Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would agree the selection of the channel to occur at the device associated with the user.

Furthermore, with respect to claims 1, 6, 10, and 15, a server can also be considered a device associated with the user.

Conclusion

7. For the reasons above, claims 1-20 have been rejected and remain pending.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MICHAEL Y. WON whose telephone number is (571)272-3993. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th: 10AM-8PM.

Art Unit: 2455

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on 571-272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Michael Won/

Primary Examiner

November 11, 2008